



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/799,455	03/12/2004	Sean E. Purcell	MS308121.1/MSFTP644US	7697
27195 7590 07/17/2008 AMIN. TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP 24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER 1900 EAST NINTH STREET CLEVELAND, OH 44114			EXAMINER MAI, KEVIN S	
			ART UNIT 2152	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 07/17/2008	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket1@thepatentattorneys.com  
hholmes@thepatentattorneys.com  
lpasterchek@thepatentattorneys.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/799,455	<b>Applicant(s)</b> PURCELL ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> KEVIN S. MAI	<b>Art Unit</b> 2152	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 April 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                       | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/7/08</u> .  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. This Office Action has been issued in response to Applicant's Amendment filed April 28, 2008.
2. Claims 5, 10, 11, 22, 34, 35 and 38-40 have been amended. Claims 1-40 have been examined and are pending.

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed April 28, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Daniell fails to disclose 'a content blocking component that blocks at least a portion of message content from appearing in at least a preview pane when the junk score exceeds a first threshold'. It is argued that Daniell teaches away from this because Daniell discloses disabling the feature of displaying a preview. While the section cited (paragraph [0043]) does disclose the features of displaying a preview of a selected message can be disabled in some embodiments, it does not state that the preview pane no longer exists. As Examiner understands, Applicant is stating that the act of disabling previewing is different than applicants because it implies that previewing would no longer exist. However paragraph [0043] of Daniell explains that Figure 8 shows an example of the disabling of the previewing, in Figure 8 it is seen that the preview pane exists but the contents of the message are just not being displayed in it. This is seen to be blocking a portion of the message content, namely the portion

Art Unit: 2152

of the message content that is the entirety of the message. As to the parts of the specification cited to explain that a portion could be both the whole message as well as parts of the message, the claim only states 'at least a portion', and as such Daniell disclosing blocking the whole portion is seen to read upon that. Therefore, Examiner respectfully maintains the rejection of claim 1.

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 22 have been considered but are not persuasive. The arguments made are seen to be the same as those made towards claim 1 and thus examiner recites the same arguments used above.

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 34 have been considered but are not persuasive. The arguments toward the preview pane made are seen to be the same as those made towards claim 1 and thus examiner recites the same arguments used above. As to the arguments made toward the amended subject matter, the arguments are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 40 have been considered but are not persuasive. The arguments made are seen to be the same as those made towards claim 1 and thus examiner recites the same arguments used above.

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 2-9, 18-21, 23-28, 38 and 39 have been considered but are not persuasive. The arguments made are based on the fact that these claims are dependent on claims 1, 22, 34 and 40 and as such are not allowable for the reasons supplied above.

Art Unit: 2152

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 10 have been considered but are not persuasive. The arguments made are seen to be the same as those made towards claim 1 and thus examiner recites the same arguments used above.

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 11 have been considered but are not persuasive. The arguments toward the preview pane made are seen to be the same as those made towards claim 1 and thus examiner recites the same arguments used above. As to the arguments made toward Adjaoute not disclosing replacing blocked content with at least a text notice, it is seen that Figure 15 of Adjaoute has replaced the blocked content with a text notice. The arguments made toward Adjaoute restricting access are irrelevant because the claim language only point towards replacing content with a text notice that notifies, and it is seen that Adjaoute discloses this feature.

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 12-17, 30-33 and 35-37 have been considered but are not persuasive. The arguments made are based on the fact that these claims are dependent on claims 1, 22 and 34 and as such are not allowable for the reasons supplied above.

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 29 have been considered but are not persuasive. The arguments made are seen to be the same as those made towards claim 22 and thus examiner recites the same arguments used above.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

13. In view of the amendment to claim 40 clarifying ‘comprising memory’ and ‘a processor executes the computer executable component’, the pending claim rejection under 35 USC § 101 has been withdrawn.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

14. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

15. Claims 1 – 9, 18 – 28 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0165895 to Rajan et al. (hereinafter "Rajan") and further in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0097174 to Daniell et al. (hereinafter “Daniell”).

16. **As to Claim 1**, Rajan discloses **a system that mitigates viewing offensive message content comprising:**

**a message receiving component that receives at least one incoming message for delivery to a user** (Paragraph [0015] of Rajan discloses that each piece of incoming mail is graded along a scale. Where taking in incoming mail is seen to inherently suggest the existence of a message receiving component);

**a filtering component that calculates a junk score for the message** (Paragraph [0015] of Rajan discloses that each piece of incoming mail is graded along a scale to determine the level of spaminess of the e-mail. Then in paragraph [0016] of Rajan an example of the scale shows that

Art Unit: 2152

incoming mail can be graded along a 0 - 100 range and this is seen to be a junk score for the messages); **and**

Rajan does not explicitly disclose **a content blocking component that blocks at least a portion of message content from appearing in at least a preview pane when the junk score exceeds a first threshold.**

However, Daniell discloses this (Paragraph [0043] of Daniell discloses that, for the spam folder, the feature of displaying a preview of a selected message has been disabled. This is because the message has been determined to be objectionable or undesired. This is seen to be the same as the claimed limitation because the portion being blocked is the entire message and since the message is in the spam folder it is apparent that the message has exceeded some threshold of for spam detection).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine calculating a junk score for incoming messages as disclosed by Rajan, with blocking a message from appearing in the preview pane as disclosed by Daniell.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine in order to prevent unintentional viewing of content determined to be objectionable or undesired. Since the purpose of a spam filtering is to prevent the user from viewing content they do not wish to view, it would be obvious to prevent the user from seeing the content via the preview pane until it was explicitly accessed.

"Common sense teaches, however, that familiar items may have obvious uses beyond their primary purposes, and in many cases a person of ordinary skill will be able to fit the teachings of multiple patents together like pieces of a puzzle...When there is a design need or

Art Unit: 2152

market pressure to solve a problem and there are a finite number of identified, predictable solutions, a person of ordinary skill has good reason to pursue the known options within his or her technical grasp. If this leads to the anticipated success, it is likely the product not of innovation but of ordinary skill and common sense." See *KSR v. Teleflex*, 550 U.S. \_\_\_, 127 S. Ct. 1727 (2007).

17. **As to Claim 2**, Rajan-Daniell discloses **the system of claim 1, further comprising a classification component that classifies the message as any one of good, junk, and a middle state** (Paragraph [0016] of Rajan discloses an example of a spam scale from 0 - 100 where messages that scored above 80 would be labeled "black", messages scoring between 30 - 80 would be labeled "gray" and then messages below 30 would be left in the inbox. This is seen to be the same as having a good, junk, and middle state) **for messages determined to be safe for an inbox but not safe for viewing or previewing the message based in part on the junk score** (Paragraph [0032] of Rajan discloses that some email may be placed in more than one directory such as the inbox (white) directory and the gray directory. Then in paragraph [0043] of Daniell it is disclosed that the feature of displaying a preview of a selected message can be disabled for spam messages. Thus it is seen that those that are rated gray/white would be in the inbox but since it is spam would still have the preview disabled).

Examiner recites the same rationale to combine used in Claim 1.

18. **As to Claim 3**, Rajan-Daniell discloses **the system of claim 2, the message is classified at least in the middle state when the junk score exceeds at least the first threshold**



Art Unit: 2152

(Paragraph [0016] of Rajan discloses an example of a spam scale from 0 - 100 where messages that scored above 80 would be labeled "black", messages scoring between 30 - 80 would be labeled "gray" and then messages below 30 would be left in the inbox. Thus it is seen that exceeding the first threshold of 30 in this situation would be classifying a message in the middle state).

19. **As to Claim 4**, Rajan-Daniell discloses **the system of claim 1, further comprising an analysis component that determines whether the junk score exceeds the first threshold**

(Paragraph [0016] of Rajan discloses an example of a spam scale from 0 - 100 where messages that scored above 80 would be labeled "black", messages scoring between 30 - 80 would be labeled "gray" and then messages below 30 would be left in the inbox. This classification step is seen to imply that determination of a message exceeding a threshold is done by the system).

20. **As to Claim 5**, Rajan-Daniell discloses **the system of claim 1, further comprising an unblocking component that receives user input to unblock the blocked portion of message content, the unblocked message content appearing in at least the preview pane** (Paragraph [0044] of Daniell discloses that messages in the spam folder may be unmarked as spam and the message that has been stored in the spam folder would be moved to the inbox folder of the user. Since the preview pane is fully enabled in the inbox it is seen that the blocked portion of the message would now be unblocked and viewable in the preview pane).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system of claim 1 as disclosed by Rajan-Daniell, with having the ability to unblock as disclosed by Daniell.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine in order to complete the functionality of the spam filter. Spam filters always risk the chance of blocking content that the user actually wishes to view. Thus it would be convenient to be able to unblock the blocked content so that the user could use an unmark as spam button to move a message to the inbox (paragraph [0044] of Daniell)

21. **As to Claim 6**, Rajan-Daniell discloses **the system of claim 5, the unblocking component operates per message** (Paragraph [0043] of Daniell discloses that messages in the spam folder may be viewed by using the message center to select a message from the spam folder and then selecting the read button. This is applying only to the selected message and as such is operating per message).

Examiner recites the same rationale to combine used in Claim 5.

22. **As to Claim 7**, Rajan-Daniell discloses **the system of claim 1, the content blocking component operates per message or globally for substantially all messages** (Paragraph [0032] of Rajan discloses that some email may be placed in more than one directory such as the inbox (white) directory and the gray directory. Then in paragraph [0043] of Daniell it is disclosed that the feature of displaying a preview of a selected message can be disabled for spam messages. Thus it is seen that those that are rated gray/white would be in the inbox but since it is

Art Unit: 2152

spam would still have the preview disabled. This scenario represents blocking operating per message. However in paragraph [0043] of Daniell the preview window being disabled applies to the whole spam folder, this implies the ability to disable the preview window for specific folders. If all folders were then disabled it would be the same as the blocking component operating globally).

Examiner recites the same rationale to combine used in Claim 1.

23. **As to Claim 8**, Rajan-Daniell discloses **the system of claim 1, the content comprises text, links, sounds, video, attachments, embedded content, applets, speech, and images** (These are seen to be obvious things to expect in an e-mail. Thus since the claimed invention deals with the content in e-mail it would be obvious to expect content to comprise the items above).

"Common sense teaches, however, that familiar items may have obvious uses beyond their primary purposes, and in many cases a person of ordinary skill will be able to fit the teachings of multiple patents together like pieces of a puzzle...When there is a design need or market pressure to solve a problem and there are a finite number of identified, predictable solutions, a person of ordinary skill has good reason to pursue the known options within his or her technical grasp. If this leads to the anticipated success, it is likely the product not of innovation but of ordinary skill and common sense." See *KSR v. Teleflex*, 550 U.S. \_\_\_, 127 S. Ct. 1727 (2007).

Art Unit: 2152

24. **As to Claim 9**, Rajan-Daniell discloses **the system of claim 1, the first threshold determined in part by user preferences** (Paragraph [0031] of Rajan discloses additional user-settable configurations may include the ability to name and color-code the spam directories, as well as the ability to assign their respective ranges. These ranges are seen to be the same as the thresholds).

25. **As to Claim 18**, Rajan-Daniell discloses **the system of claim 1, further comprising a rating component that rates incoming messages as unscanned before they are subjected to the filtering component** (Paragraph [0030] of Rajan discloses as incoming e-mail is received by the mail server it is graded for spaminess and then moved to the inbox and/or spam directories. During the time period between reception and being graded it is seen that the letters are inherently classified as unscanned, since they have no rating and are only moved to the inbox after being graded).

26. **As to Claim 19**, Rajan-Daniell discloses **the system of claim 18, unscanned messages are hidden from view and are not visible in a user's inbox while additional data about the message is collected or while the message is being filtered by the filtering component** (Paragraph [0030] of Rajan discloses as incoming e-mail is received by the mail server it is graded for spaminess and then moved to the inbox and/or spam directories. During the time period between reception and being graded it is seen that the letters are inherently classified as unscanned, since they have no rating and are only moved to the inbox after being graded. Since

Art Unit: 2152

they are not placed into the inbox until after filtering, the messages are effectively hidden from view and are not visible).

27. **As to Claim 20**, Rajan-Daniell discloses **the system of claim 18, unscanned messages are made visible in a user's inbox when the filtering component is turned off** (Figure 4 of Daniell discloses being able to turn off spam filtering and next to the selection it is explained that all emails will be delivered to the inbox. Thus it is seen that when filtering is off all messages would be visible).

It is seen that being able to turn off the filter is an obvious feature of the system. Furthermore, once the filter is turned off it is disclosed in Daniell that all emails will be delivered to the inbox. Given that nothing will be marked as spam, none of them would be blocked and as such they would all be visible. Thus it is seen that this limitation is disclosed by Rajan and Daniell.

"Common sense teaches, however, that familiar items may have obvious uses beyond their primary purposes, and in many cases a person of ordinary skill will be able to fit the teachings of multiple patents together like pieces of a puzzle...When there is a design need or market pressure to solve a problem and there are a finite number of identified, predictable solutions, a person of ordinary skill has good reason to pursue the known options within his or her technical grasp. If this leads to the anticipated success, it is likely the product not of innovation but of ordinary skill and common sense." See *KSR v. Teleflex*, 550 U.S. \_\_\_, 127 S. Ct. 1727 (2007).

28. **As to Claim 21**, Rajan-Daniell discloses **a computer readable medium having stored thereon the system of claim 1** (Claim 11 of Rajan discloses a computer-readable medium comprising program instructions for its invention).

29. **As to Claim 22**, Rajan discloses **a method that mitigates viewing offensive message content comprising:**

**receiving at least one incoming message** (Paragraph [0015] of Rajan discloses that each piece of incoming mail is graded along a scale);

**computing a junk score for the at least one message** (Paragraph [0015] of Rajan discloses that each piece of incoming mail is graded along a scale to determine the level of spaminess of the e-mail. Then in paragraph [0016] of Rajan an example of the scale shows that incoming mail can be graded along a 0 - 100 range and this is seen to be a junk score for the messages);

Rajan does not explicitly disclose **previewing the at least one incoming message in at least a preview pane; and**

**blocking at least a portion of message content from appearing in at least the preview pane when the junk score exceeds a blocking threshold.**

However, Daniell discloses this (Paragraph [0030] of Daniell discloses displaying a preview pane having a preview of a selected email message. Then paragraph [0043] of Daniell discloses that, for the spam folder, the feature of displaying a preview of a selected message has been disabled. This is because the message has been determined to be objectionable or undesired. This is seen to be the same as the claimed limitation because the portion being

blocked is the entire message and since the message is in the spam folder it is apparent that the message has exceeded some threshold of for spam detection).

Examiner recites the same rationale to combine used in Claim 1.

30. **As to Claim 23**, Rajan-Daniell discloses **the method of claim 22, further comprising classifying the message based in part on a computed junk score** (Paragraph [0016] of Rajan discloses an example of a spam scale from 0 - 100 where messages that scored above 80 would be labeled "black", messages scoring between 30 - 80 would be labeled "gray" and then messages below 30 would be left in the inbox).

31. **As to Claim 24**, Rajan-Daniell discloses **the method of claim 22, filer comprising classifying the message as unscanned before computing the junk score** (Paragraph [0030] of Rajan discloses as incoming e-mail is received by the mail server it is graded for spaminess and then moved to the inbox and/or spam directories. During the time period between reception and being graded it is seen that the letters are inherently classified as unscanned, since they have no rating and are only moved to the inbox after being graded).

32. **As to Claim 25**, Rajan-Daniell discloses **the method of claim 24, further comprising updating the message from unscanned to some other rating based in part on its computed junk score** (Paragraph [0030] of Rajan discloses as incoming e-mail is received by the mail server it is graded for spaminess and then moved to the inbox and/or spam directories. During the time period between reception and being graded it is seen that the letters are inherently

classified as unscanned, since they have no rating and are only moved to the inbox after being graded. However after being graded it is then moved to the appropriate directories at which point it would be classified under those directories. Thus the score is seen to be updated).

33. **As to Claim 26**, Rajan-Daniell discloses **the method of claim 22, the content comprising at least one of text, images, sounds, audio, video, applets, embedded text, embedded images, URLs, and speech** (These are seen to be obvious things to expect in an e-mail. Thus since the claimed invention deals with the content in e-mail it would be obvious to expect content to comprise the items above).

"Common sense teaches, however, that familiar items may have obvious uses beyond their primary purposes, and in many cases a person of ordinary skill will be able to fit the teachings of multiple patents together like pieces of a puzzle...When there is a design need or market pressure to solve a problem and there are a finite number of identified, predictable solutions, a person of ordinary skill has good reason to pursue the known options within his or her technical grasp. If this leads to the anticipated success, it is likely the product not of innovation but of ordinary skill and common sense." See *KSR v. Teleflex*, 550 U.S. \_\_\_, 127 S. Ct. 1727 (2007).

34. **As to Claim 27**, Rajan-Daniell discloses **the method of claim 22, further comprising unblocking blocked content when explicit user input to unblock the content is received** (Paragraph [0043] of Daniell discloses that messages in the spam folder may be viewed by using the message center to select a message from the spam folder and then selecting the read button.



Art Unit: 2152

This allows the user to read the text associated with the selected message. Since the message that was in the spam folder was previously not viewable in the preview screen (blocked) and then distinct user input (selecting the read button) allows the letter to be read (unblocked), this is seen to be the same as the claimed limitation).

Examiner recites the same rationale to combine used in Claim 5.

35. **As to Claim 28**, Rajan-Daniell discloses **the method of claim 22, blocking the message content applies to substantially all messages globally when feature is activated** (Paragraph [0043] of Daniell the preview window being disabled applies to the whole spam folder, this implies the ability to disable the preview window for specific folders. If all folders were then disabled it would be the same as the blocking component operating globally).

Examiner recites the same rationale to combine used in Claim 1.

36. **As to Claim 40**, Rajan discloses **a computer executable system, comprising a memory having stored therein computer executable components that transmit a data packet between two or more computer processes, wherein the data packet is transmitted to mitigate viewing offensive message content, the data packet comprising** (Paragraph [0031] of Rajan discloses that the system may employ a server/client topology where the information may be processed by either individually or partly by both. Thus since they need to communicate it would be seen that a data packet exists that comprised the following information): **information associated with receiving at least one incoming message** (Paragraph [0015] of Rajan discloses that each piece of incoming mail is graded along a scale); **computing a junk score for the at**

Art Unit: 2152

**least one message** (Paragraph [0015] of Rajan discloses that each piece of incoming mail is graded along a scale to determine the level of spaminess of the e-mail. Then in paragraph [0016] of Rajan an example of the scale shows that incoming mail can be graded along a 0 - 100 range and this is seen to be a junk score for the messages). Rajan does not explicitly disclose **blocking at least a portion of message content from appearing in at least a preview pane when the junk score exceeds a blocking threshold;**

However, Daniell discloses this (Paragraph [0043] of Daniell discloses that, for the spam folder, the feature of displaying a preview of a selected message has been disabled. This is because the message has been determined to be objectionable or undesired. This is seen to be the same as the claimed limitation because the portion being blocked is the entire message and since the message is in the spam folder it is apparent that the message has exceeded some threshold of for spam detection)

Examiner recites the same rationale to combine used in Claim 1.

**and wherein a processor executes the computer executable components** (Paragraph [0031] of Rajan discloses the computer executable components being executed on processors).

37. Claims 10, 34, 38 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rajan-Daniell and further in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0147782 to Dimitrova et al. (hereinafter "Dimitrova").

38. **As to Claim 10**, Rajan-Daniell discloses **the system of claim 1**. Rajan-Daniell does not explicitly disclose **the content blocking component blocks at least a portion of the message content by performing at least one of the following:**

- hiding at least a portion of the content of the message;**
- hiding at least a portion of a subject line of the message;**
- hiding content in a from line of the message;**
- blurring at least a portion of the subject line of the message;**
- blurring content in the from line of the message; or**
- blurring at least a portion of the content of the message.**

However, Dimitrova discloses this (Paragraph [0016] of Dimitrova discloses masking portions of the video or audio content, for example blurring a naked body. It is noted that Dimitrova suggests in paragraph [0035] implementing the parental control system in an e-mail system. Thus it is seen that Dimitrova discloses performing at least one of the above actions).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system of claim 1 as disclosed by Rajan and Daniell, with blurring content as disclosed by Dimitrova.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine in order to permit a method of parental control that filter only the offending portions instead of merely blocking entire messages (Paragraph [0012] of Dimitrova). This would allow a child to view the majority of a message, but not content a parent would deem unfit for the child to view.

39. **As to Claim 34, Rajan discloses a system that mitigates viewing offensive message content comprising:**

**means for receiving at least one incoming message** (Paragraph [0015] of Rajan discloses that each piece of incoming mail is graded along a scale);

**means for computing a junk score for the at least one message** (Paragraph [0015] of Rajan discloses that each piece of incoming mail is graded along a scale to determine the level of spaminess of the e-mail. Then in paragraph [0016] of Rajan an example of the scale shows that incoming mail can be graded along a 0 - 100 range and this is seen to be a junk score for the messages); **and**

Rajan does not explicitly disclose **means for blocking at least a portion of message content from appearing in at least a preview pane when the junk score exceeds a blocking threshold,**

However, Daniell discloses this (Paragraph [0043] of Daniell discloses that, for the spam folder, the feature of displaying a preview of a selected message has been disabled. This is because the message has been determined to be objectionable or undesired. This is seen to be the same as the claimed limitation because the portion being blocked is the entire message and since the message is in the spam folder it is apparent that the message has exceeded some threshold of for spam detection)

Examiner recites the same rationale to combine used in Claim 1.

Rajan does not explicitly disclose **wherein blocking the at least portion of message content from appearing in the preview pane comprises at least one of the following:**

**hiding at least a portion of the content of the message;**

**hiding at least a portion of a subject line of the message;**

**hiding content in a from line of the message;**

**blurring at least a portion of the subject line of the message;**

**blurring content in the from line of the message; or**

**blurring at least a portion of the content of the message.**

However, Dimitrova discloses this (Paragraph [0016] of Dimitrova discloses masking portions of the video or audio content, for example blurring a naked body. It is noted that Dimitrova suggests in paragraph [0035] implementing the parental control system in an e-mail system. Thus it is seen that Dimitrova discloses performing at least one of the above actions)

Examiner recites the same rationale to combine used in claim 10.

40. **As to Claim 38**, Rajan-Daniell-Dimitrova discloses **the system of claim 34, further comprising means for unblocking blocked content when explicit user input to unblock the content is received** (Paragraph [0043] of Daniell discloses that messages in the spam folder may be viewed by using the message center to select a message from the spam folder and then selecting the read button. This allows the user to read the text associated with the selected message. Since the message that was in the spam folder was previously not viewable in the preview screen (blocked) and then distinct user input (selecting the read button) allows the letter to be read (unblocked), this is seen to be the same as the claimed limitation).

Examiner recites the same rationale to combine used in Claim 5.

41. **As to Claim 39**, Rajan-Daniell-Dimitrova discloses **the system of claim 34, further comprising means for classifying the message as unscanned before computing the junk score** (Paragraph [0030] of Rajan discloses as incoming e-mail is received by the mail server it is graded for spaminess and then moved to the inbox and/or spam directories. During the time period between reception and being graded it is seen that the letters are inherently classified as unscanned, since they have no rating and are only moved to the inbox after being graded).

42. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rajan-Daniell and further in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0009495 to Adjaoute (hereinafter “Adjaoute”).

43. **As to Claim 11**, Rajan-Daniell discloses **the system of claim 1**. Rajan-Daniell does not explicitly disclose **the content blocking component replaces blocked content with at least one of text notice, graphics notice, video notice, or audio notice, such notices warning users that potentially offensive content has been blocked from view**.

However, Adjaoute discloses this (Paragraph [0057] of Adjaoute discloses that if the content is restricted, then a message is displayed instead of the content saying that the access to the content has been restricted. It is noted that Adjaoute deals primarily with websites however in paragraph [0029] it suggest the software plug-in being installed in an email application).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system of claim 1 as disclosed by Rajan-Daniell, with replacing the blocked content as disclosed by Adjaoute.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine in order to help the filter prevent viewing of offensive material. Paragraph [0006] of Adjaoute shares that the goal would be to control the information that children can receive. Thus it is seen that it would be advantageous to block the material and inform the participant that what they are trying to access has been blocked.

44. Claims 12 – 17 and 30 – 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rajan-Daniell and further in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0204569 to Andrews et al. (hereinafter “Andrews”).

45. **As to Claim 12**, Rajan-Daniell discloses **the system of claim 1**. Rajan-Daniell does not explicitly disclose **further comprising a challenge-response component that requests message senders to correctly respond to at least one challenge per message received when the junk score of that message exceeds a second threshold before delivery of the message is permitted**.

However, Andrews discloses this (Figure 4 of Andrews discloses the process for incoming email messages. As the message flows through the process various things are checked such as whether a message is spam-like, has a potential virus, or if the sender is suspicious. If a message appears to be any of those things the message is issued a challenge. Then in paragraph [0087] of Andrews it is explained that if the system judges that the sender has passed the test the message is placed into the user's inbox).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system of claim 1 as disclosed by Rajan-Daniell, with the challenge system disclosed by Andrews.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine in order to increase the security of the spam filter. Andrews explains in paragraph [0007] that a challenge would help verify that the source of the potentially infected/spam email is a human and not a machine. Since most spam is generated by a machine as opposed to individually sent out by humans such a system would help filter out many messages.

46. **As to Claim 13**, Rajan-Daniell-Andrews discloses **the system of claim 12, the second threshold is any one of higher or lower than the first threshold** (Paragraph [0031] of Rajan discloses additional user-settable configurations may include the ability to name and color-code the spam directories, as well as the ability to assign their respective ranges. It is noted that because Rajan discloses a user setting up the configurations for his various spam directories that it would be obvious to either have the second threshold higher or lower depending on the personal preference of the user).

47. **As to Claim 14**, Rajan-Daniell-Andrews discloses **the system of claim 12, the second threshold is about equal to the first threshold** (Paragraph [0031] of Rajan discloses additional user-settable configurations may include the ability to name and color-code the spam directories,



Art Unit: 2152

as well as the ability to assign their respective ranges. Since the ranges are determined by the user, making the second threshold about equal to the first would be easily done).

48. **As to Claim 15**, Rajan-Daniell-Andrews discloses **the system of claim 12, the second threshold is determined at least in part by user preferences** (Paragraph [0031] of Rajan discloses additional user-settable configurations may include the ability to name and color-code the spam directories, as well as the ability to assign their respective ranges. These ranges are seen to be the same as the thresholds).

49. **As to Claim 16**, Rajan-Daniell-Andrews discloses **the system of claim 12, the message associated with the challenged sender is hidden from view in a user's inbox until the challenge is correctly solved** (Figure 1 of Andrews discloses a letter being detained in the smart email filtering system until a correct response is received. This is effectively hiding the message from view until it is correctly solved).

Examiner recites the same rationale to combine used in claim 12.

50. **As to Claim 17**, Rajan-Daniell-Andrews discloses **the system of claim 12, content of the message is blocked when the message is released to the user's inbox following a correctly solved challenge since the message's junk score exceeds the first threshold** (Figure 4 of Andrews discloses the process for incoming email messages. As the message flows through the process various things are checked such as whether a message is spam-like, has a potential virus, or if the sender is suspicious. If a message appears to be any of those things, the message

Art Unit: 2152

is issued a challenge. Then in paragraph [0087] of Andrews it is explained that if the system judges that the sender has passed the test the message is placed into the user's inbox. It is seen that since the letter was placed into the inbox and that, as disclosed above, letters in the inbox with sufficient ratings are blocked, it would be obvious that after a message comes back from a challenge that it would still be blocked once deposited in the inbox).

Examiner recites the same rationale to combine used in claim 12.

51. **As to Claim 30**, Rajan-Daniell discloses **the method of claim 22**. Rajan-Daniell does not explicitly disclose **further comprising challenging a sender of the message before revealing any blocked content of the message**.

However, Andrews discloses this (Figure 4 of Andrews discloses the process for incoming email messages. As the message flows through the process various things are checked such as whether a message is spam-like, has a potential virus, or if the sender is suspicious. If a message appears to be any of those things, the message is issued a challenge. Then in paragraph [0087] of Andrews it is explained that if the system judges that the sender has passed the test the message is placed into the user's inbox).

Examiner recites the same rationale to combine used in claim 12.

52. **As to Claim 31**, Rajan-Daniell discloses **the method of claim 22**. Rajan-Daniell does not explicitly disclose **further comprising challenging a sender of the message before allowing delivery of the message when the junk score of the message exceeds a challenge threshold**.

However, Andrews discloses this (Figure 4 of Andrews discloses the process for incoming email messages. As the message flows through the process various things are checked such as whether a message is spam-like, has a potential virus, or if the sender is suspicious. If a message appears to be any of those things, the message is issued a challenge. Then in paragraph [0087] of Andrews it is explained that if the system judges that the sender has passed the test the message is placed into the user's inbox).

Examiner recites the same rationale to combine used in claim 12.

53. **As to Claim 32**, Rajan-Daniell-Andrews discloses **the method of claim 31, the challenge threshold is any one of higher or lower than the blocking threshold** (Paragraph [0031] of Rajan discloses additional user-settable configurations may include the ability to name and color-code the spam directories, as well as the ability to assign their respective ranges. It is noted that because Rajan discloses a user setting up the configurations for his various spam directories that it would be obvious to either have the second threshold higher or lower depending on the personal preference of the user).

54. **As to Claim 33**, Rajan-Daniell-Andrews discloses **the method of claim 31, the challenge threshold is about equal to the blocking threshold** (Paragraph [0031] of Rajan discloses additional user-settable configurations may include the ability to name and color-code the spam directories, as well as the ability to assign their respective ranges. Since the ranges are determined by the user, making the second threshold about equal to the first would be easily done).

55. Claims 35-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rajan-Daniell-Dimitrova and further in view of Andrews.

56. **As to Claim 35**, Rajan-Daniell-Dimitrova discloses **the system of claim 34**. Rajan-Daniell-Dimitrova does not explicitly disclose **further comprising means for challenging a sender of the message before allowing delivery of the message when the junk score of the message exceeds a challenge threshold**.

However, Andrews discloses this (Figure 4 of Andrews discloses the process for incoming email messages. As the message flows through the process various things are checked such as whether a message is spam-like, has a potential virus, or if the sender is suspicious. If a message appears to be any of those things, the message is issued a challenge. Then in paragraph [0087] of Andrews it is explained that if the system judges that the sender has passed the test the message is placed into the user's inbox).

Examiner recites the same rationale to combine used in claim 12.

57. **As to Claim 36**, Rajan-Daniell-Dimitrova-Andrews discloses **the system of claim 35**, **the challenge threshold is any one of higher or lower than the blocking threshold** (Paragraph [0031] of Rajan discloses additional user-settable configurations may include the ability to name and color-code the spam directories, as well as the ability to assign their respective ranges. It is noted that because Rajan discloses a user setting up the configurations for his various spam

Art Unit: 2152

directories that it would be obvious to either have the second threshold higher or lower depending on the personal preference of the user).

58. As to **Claim 37**, Rajan-Daniell-Dimitrova-Andrews discloses **the system of claim 35, the challenge threshold is about equal to the blocking threshold** (Paragraph [0031] of Rajan discloses additional user-settable configurations may include the ability to name and color-code the spam directories, as well as the ability to assign their respective ranges. Since the ranges are determined by the user, making the second threshold about equal to the first would be easily done).

59. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rajan-Daniell and further in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0080889 to Malik et al. (hereinafter "Malik").

60. As to **Claim 29**, Rajan-Daniell discloses **the method of claim 22**. Rajan-Daniell does not explicitly disclose **further comprising requiring a password to open messages in which content has been blocked**.

However, Malik discloses this (Paragraph [0071] of Malik discloses child protection in an email system where it can be set such that to get access to a child's spam folder one would have to enter in the master or parent password. This is seen to be the same as needing a password to access messages that are blocked).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of claim 22 as disclosed by Rajan and Daniell, with requiring a password as disclosed by Malik.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine in order to prevent children from viewing content that a parent would deem inappropriate for viewing. Thus it is to provide a method that restricts a child type user from performing a restricted operation (paragraph [0007] Malik).

### ***Conclusion***

61. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KEVIN S. MAI whose telephone number is (571)270-5001. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:30 - 5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on 571-272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

KSM

/Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2152